

**A Follow-up Study of Recent Graduates of the M.A. Program
in Counseling Psychology**

A Plan B Paper

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
Of the University of Minnesota, Duluth

Under the direction of

Dr. Jane Hovland, Committee Chair

Dr. H. Mitzi Doane

Dr. Kenneth Gilbertson

In partial fulfillment of a requirement for the degree

Master of Arts

Counseling Psychology

by

Amanda L. Lufholm

December, 2001

Acknowledgements:

A special thanks to my Plan B Committee: Drs. H. Mitzi Doane, Kenneth Gilbertson and Jane Hovland, especially, for her encouragement, suggestions and patience.

Special thanks, also, to other teachers in my life: Becky Larsen, Grandpa and Grandma, Matt and Emily, and Dad and Mom. Without your encouragement I could not have aimed for the stars.

In loving memory of Grandma Lufholm

Abstract

Follow-up studies of graduate programs can provide significant evaluative material to aid in program revision or enhancement. The present study reflects a survey of graduates of the UMD Counseling Psychology program (1995-2000). A response rate of 55.69% (n=44) was achieved. Results reflect rankings of adequacy and utility of courses and experiences in the program, as well as their relevance to current work settings. Settings reflect the preparation tracks in the program (school or community counseling). Graduates rated all courses above average, with individual counseling skills training and group counseling achieving the highest utility scores within the program. Least useful were statistics and research design, although graduates stated that their preparation in these areas was highly adequate.

The paper addresses framework for program evaluation, keeping in mind the mission and philosophy of the Counseling Psychology Program. Recommendations for incorporating survey results into program improvements are discussed in relation to CACREP standards.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Table of Tables.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Methods.....	18
Results.....	23
Conclusions.....	36
References.....	46
Table of Appendices.....	48
Appendix A.....	49
Appendix B.....	50

Table of Tables

Table 1: <i>Graduate Respondents' Degree Emphases</i> ...	p. 20
Table 2: <i>License Types of Graduate Respondents</i> ...	p.21
Table 3: <i>Respondents' Settings of Employment</i> ...	p.21
Table 4: <i>Employment Functions of School and Community Counselors Arranged by Adequacy</i> ...	p. 23
Table 5: <i>Community Counselors' Assessment of Adequacy for Employment Functions Arranged by Most to Least Amount of Time Spent in Function</i> ...	p.25
Table 6: <i>School Counselors' Assessment of Adequacy for Employment Functions Arranged by Most to Least Amount of Time Spent in Function</i> ...	p.26
Table 7: <i>A Comparison of the Top Three Employment Function Adequacy Scores and Percentage of Time for School Counselors, Community Counselors, and Overall Scores</i> ...	p.27
Table 8: <i>Respondents' Ranking of Courses by Utility (most to least useful)</i> ...	p.29
Table 9: <i>Respondents' Ranking of Courses by Adequacy (most to least adequate)</i> .	p.30
Table 10: <i>Perceived Adequacy of Faculty Feedback in Professional Development</i> ...	p.31
Table 11: <i>Perceived Adequacy of Faculty Availability</i> ...	p.32

Introduction

Evaluation, like education, is a necessary process which leads to improvement and growth. The current study focuses on the possible growth and improvement of an educational program, specifically, the Counseling Psychology graduate program at the University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Because the University of Minnesota, Duluth (hereafter referred to as UMD) is a state funded school, citizens of the state have a stake in well-educated graduates. It is important that reviews of programs occur regularly, with the goal of identifying indicators of educational adequacy and quality. The University of Minnesota Graduate School (of which many UMD programs are a part) requires a program review process every 10 years (Hedman, 2001).

Accreditation

In addition to a 10-year cycle of program review, the university has emphasized external accreditation as another quality indicator for its various programs, especially those with professional emphases. The sole relevant accrediting body for students in professional counseling preparation is the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). UMD's Counseling Psychology Program was first accredited in 1990 (Gum, 1990). 1994 CACREP standards require an accreditation study every seven years (CACREP, 1994, p. 20) as well as self-studies every three years (CACREP, 1996, p72.) The CACREP 2001 Accreditation Standards revised the seven-year requirement to every ten years. Implied in these requirements is the need to continuously update and

change course content in order to best serve the educational needs of students. Such changes require evaluation following their implementation to make sure that the changes result in the expected program improvements. CACREP recommends that the changes be made in writing and presented to program faculty at the beginning of each evaluation period (1994, p. 72).

Sources of Data

Data collected for program evaluation can have many sources: faculty, course evaluations, alumni, employers and opinion of experts in the field. Faculty at UMD are required to evaluate fifty percent of their courses each year. This allows faculty fairly immediate information about the quality of teaching. Alumni surveys, such as the instrument used in this study, are fairly common for assessing the usefulness of education. Students involved in the programs need to be a critical part of this chain. Their education and future employment are critical to the existence of the program. The students need to be aware of the proposed changes and given a chance to evaluate the outcome of the change.

Another link in this chain are the employers and internship supervisors. Feedback from the supervisors and employers to the educational institution will allow graduates to be fully prepared for the challenges and developments within the career field. Employers can also provide internship positions or feedback to the limitations of the program based on the training needed for new employees.

What is a Program Evaluation?

It is essential that institutions or programs designed to meet needs of individuals be accountable for the services provided. Meeting the needs of constituents in an efficient and timely manner is essential in human service settings. However, other organizations, such as large corporations, universities or school systems, also need to assure those who are impacted by their programs (stakeholders) that they are providing adequate services that go beyond minimal expectations. One of the most common ways to assure stakeholders that the services are adequate, or greater, is through a program evaluation.

State funded educational programs such as academic units, graduate schools and student-need related services (tutoring programs, testing accommodation services and libraries, for example) need to demonstrate that they are doing what they said they would do, namely educate the students excellently (Owen & Rogers, 1999). Taxpayers want to know that their dollars are being used efficiently. Grant-funded non-profit organizations need to show their programs are efficiently meeting the needs of constituents while also maximizing funding dollars. In a university, experimental programs, such as women's athletics or controversial student organizations, begin as grant-funded groups and later are expected to statistically prove that they are viable programs worth funding. Both state funded organizations as well as grant-funded programs within the university benefit from the use of program evaluation (Owen & Rogers, 1999).

Levels of program assessment

According to Owen and Rogers (1999), there are three levels that can be assessed in a Program Evaluation: mega, macro and micro. A corporation or entire organization is evaluated at the mega level. In a mega level study, the economic or social impact is typically evaluated. For example, a university could conduct a study to measure the economic impact the university has on a state. A legislature would want assurances that tax dollars are being spent wisely. In a macro study, evaluators would examine divisions or branch campuses, such as the University of Minnesota in Duluth or Morris. Evaluators may also study the different branches or schools within the university. They may compare the College of Science at UMD to the College of Science at UM -Morris. The focus of the evaluation would be an assessment of comparability in educating students. In micro- level studies, units or individual programs are studied. In addition to programs, specific departments or courses within programs may be evaluated. These evaluations may demonstrate teaching effectiveness; student outcomes, or the use of funding. The stakeholders in each level of evaluation are different and are concerned with different issues. However, the general aim is demonstrating the value or worth of what is being evaluated.

The present study is a micro evaluation of the Graduate Program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Minnesota- Duluth. Stakeholders in this situation include students including those who are enrolling in the program in the near future, graduates, the faculty, employers, university officials and the accrediting body

of the American Counseling Association, CACREP. The interests of each stakeholder are different, but all can be addressed in a study such as this.

An important factor to consider is that a program does not exist in a vacuum. When results are obtained and conclusions are made, rarely can a cause-effect relationship be established. Individuals within programs, as well as those who are funding them, influence programs. Additionally, factors beyond a program's control, (such as personal or individual circumstances of those responding to a survey), may result in undeserved criticism or praise. These factors, however, are of lesser concern than the general importance of periodic review of a program.

Why should a program be evaluated?

Program Evaluation "is the use of social science research methods by evaluators, administrators or practitioners to assess the planning, implementation or outcome of social programs"(Smith, 1990, p.15). Evaluatees use the results of program evaluation at differing times for differing reasons. A program evaluation can reveal practical information, such as good educational decisions, wasteful procedures or the necessity for a new program. An evaluation may document and direct attention to weak spots or address financial concerns. Accountability of the evaluatee to the stakeholders may also result. (Krause, 1996). Following the recommendations of the program evaluator, there are expected changes. Many universities regularly use course evaluations for change and improvement in their curriculum. Additionally, self-study provides a framework upon which to implement changes recommended to the evaluatee.

How is a program evaluated?

After deciding on the level of evaluation, the framework for an evaluation must be determined. There are several different frameworks to use, but all come back to the same basics: establish criteria, construct standards, measure/compare, and synthesize/integrate (Owen & Rogers, 1999).

Establish Criteria

When the evaluation begins, it is important that the evaluator knows what the stakeholders want to evaluate. It is also essential that all parties know the ethical standards of evaluation (Krause, 1996, Owen & Rogers, 1999, Smith, 1990). One standard is that the evaluator is objective when the study is done. Part of being an ethical evaluator is knowing the philosophy and rationale of the program being evaluated. When the evaluator can see the mission and the day-to-day operations of the organization, the picture is less biased and less dependent on how the evaluator “thinks” the program should operate or on what the stakeholders have influenced the evaluator to believe the program is about (Owen & Rogers, 1999).

UMD’s Program philosophy is based within the developmental philosophy which encourages “growth and prevention rather than remediation.” The department recognizes that individuals are continuously developing and that counselor education is “a phenomenological interaction of all the people who are in their respective developmental stages” (Philosophy Document). Based on developmental philosophy, objectives are focused on preventative philosophy as well as understanding of the remainder of the areas of counseling: humanistic, behavioral, cognitive,

psychodynamic and systematic philosophies. Other objectives include the appreciation of the diversity of individuals, the understanding of group processes and the ability to pursue licensure following graduation. The philosophy of development steers the objectives of developing not only scholars but also practitioners.

After the evaluator has a picture of the program, it is important to clarify the evaluation. Things that need to be clarified include the objectives of the evaluation; who the stakeholders are; and who will receive the results, and what time, monetary and human resources are available (Owen & Rogers, 1999). It is also important to discover what is already known about the program. When these questions are answered the evaluator has a starting point defined and the expectations of the organization clearly defined.

Once the evaluator has a clear focus for the program, an evaluation approach needs to be chosen. Approaches include objectives- based, needs- based and goal-free evaluation (Owen & Rogers, 1999). Objectives based evaluation demonstrates if the organization is performing in a way that the objectives of the organization are being met. The needs of the constituents are evaluated in needs based evaluation. In goal- free evaluation there is no specific part of the organization that is evaluated but both objectives and needs are addressed. In the study of UMD's Counseling Psychology graduate program, an objectives- based approach was used. The objectives of the department are oriented toward producing individuals who are trained to enter their chosen careers upon graduation. To find out if this is the case,

contacting graduates to evaluate a program and its courses in light of present employment is a necessity.

Once the type of evaluation is chosen and agreed upon, it is expected that a description of the program be written. Such a description would include items such as rationale, intervention methods, key elements, settings, funding (cost) (Smith, 1990), and other pertinent components of the program. When the evaluation is complete, recommendations can be made based on the previously completed summary of the program. This serves as an anchor or reference point for the inevitable changes that may occur during the time frame of an evaluation.

The final piece that needs completing during this phase of the evaluation is the operational definitions of the components of the evaluation and program. For example, in the UMD study, education cannot be measured on an attitude scale. However, usefulness of an education can be measured through a Likert scale and the label “good” can be assigned to scores in the 6 to 7 range. Operational definitions must be made at this point to avoid bias once results are compiled. In the current study, the words “adequacy” and “utility” are used. “Adequacy,” the “quality or state of being acceptable or satisfactory”(Guralnik, 1975) is used to describe the preparation of courses for the employment setting as well as the training for skills used in employment settings. “Utility” refers to the usefulness, or the “quality of being beneficial”(Guralnik, 1975) and is used in relation to particular courses. The utility and adequacy scores provide a framework for accountability. They also highlight the strengths and limitations of the program.

Construct Standards

In this phase, there are three objectives: choosing a paradigm, choosing an evaluation form and finally writing the evaluation questions. In choosing a paradigm, the evaluator describes the world of the program. The evaluation form that is chosen is based on what is wanted from the evaluation (which was discovered in the first portion of the study), and once the framework is in place the questions may be asked. There are three paradigms that are typically used: post-positivist, constructivist, and emergent realism. The post-positivist paradigm describes generalizable knowledge. The assumption is that systematic and stable relationships exist between social phenomena. This type of paradigm has a large data set. The second paradigm, constructivist, is inductive reasoning based on the theory that there is no objective reality to a sophisticated description must be made based on the perspectives of all concerned. The final paradigm the type used in the UMD study, hypothesizes that reality can be described—tentatively, through systematic methods.

Once the theory behind the evaluation is identified the form of the evaluation can be made. The forms: proactive, claritive, interactive, monitoring and impact evaluation (Owen & Rogers, 1999) all have different purposes. The proactive form attempts to solve a problem in a community. This needs- based approach is generally used with a new program and provides input into further decisions and planning. The claritive evaluation defines the structure and function of a program and links the activities within the program with the outcomes intended for the program. The interactive evaluation documents incremental improvement as the program becomes

more effective. A monitoring evaluation uses performance analysis, systems assessment and component analysis to document that the needs of the constituent are being met. The final evaluation, the impact evaluation, aids in making decisions about the “merit” of a program (Owen & Rogers, 1999). It answers questions about whether goals are achieved or if the program is cost effective. Performance audits, goal free evaluations, needs based and objective based evaluations are all appropriate. These evaluations, and more specifically, the Impact Evaluation, are “predicated on the not unreasonable assumption that citizens at large should know whether programs funded by government or in which they have an interest are making a difference” (Owens & Rogers, 1999, p. 263).

The final portion of preparing for an evaluation is actually formulating and asking the pertinent questions. It is important to remember, “the choice of methodology follows from the questions asked, not vice versa” (Owens & Rogers, 1999, p. 88). The formulation of the questions, however, is based on what the evaluand has specifically requested for the focus of the study. The questions are based on the list of areas to be evaluated given to the evaluator based on previous conversations with the evaluand. These questions, then, are limited based on time, financial, and other restraints. One key to remember is that the questions must point to the objectives of the study and they must be in the same terms as the operational definitions already created. Once the main study questions are formulated, the design, data collection, and instrumentation techniques can be selected (Smith, 1990). Once this is complete, the sample can be chosen. In selecting the design, it is

important to match the desired outcome (and questions) with the design. Surveys are designed to document in a systematic manner the client experience in a program, whereas a pre-post design documents change and an experiment examines cause and effect relationships. In the present study, a survey was viewed as the most appropriate because it represents an efficient method of assessing the attitudes of the UMD alumni.

Measure and Compare

This third phase begins with a few words of warning about collecting evidence from organizational surveys. Henerson (1987) offers several recommendations for the writing of a survey. He recommends using simple words in short items and in doing so, avoiding double negatives or other ambiguous phrases which may obscure the original intent. The use of parsimonious and familiar language avoids the trap of strange terms or overlapping alternatives. Loaded questions and over-demanding questions, also, should be avoided. These guidelines were applied in the present study.

The survey prepared for UMD's study fits these qualifications and was chosen to be the basis of this survey because it was similar to another survey study for UMD done by Shomion-Karsnia in 1997. Surveys are useful sources of data for this type of study because they may be distributed to large quantities of individuals in a short amount of time. The downfall of survey research is the historically low return rate.

When gathering data, it is important to remember that the researcher is not the final stopping place for the information. The data must be useful to the client and therefore, data need to be simply presented. Many times data are analyzed in a manner that is complicated when there is another way to simplify the data making it more meaningful to the audience. Conclusion drawing, also, is the process of making meaning about the data in the context of the evaluation questions being examined.

Synthesis and Integration

The final portion of program evaluation is creating a plan and passing along the findings of the evaluation to the audience. This key step is occasionally overlooked and evaluations will fail if their conclusions are not disseminated (Owens & Rogers, 1999). This dissemination relies

on communication between stakeholders and their audience as well as between the evaluator and stakeholders.

Methods

Design

The design for the study was based on descriptive survey research. Graduates' perceptions of their (1) overall preparation, (2) adequacy and usefulness of coursework and (3) job function preparation were measured. The dependent variable was a survey with responses that measured UMD's preparation of graduates for their present employment. This measure was achieved through a Likert-type rating scale with low values representing perceptions of deficient preparation/usefulness and high values representing perceptions of outstanding preparation/usefulness.

A correlational approach was used in the second phase of analysis. The results of the perceived usefulness and perceived adequacy scales were compared to specific courses offered by the program (see Tables 8 and 9). These categories were based on Shomion-Karsnia's study and adapted for current courses. Responses were also considered in relation to the varying degree emphases among graduates: School, Community or College.

Subjects

The respondents to this survey are alumni of the UMD Department of Counseling Psychology (formerly Educational Psychology) who had completed their Masters' degrees within the last 5 years. There were 86 individuals who were identified as potential subjects. Of these, the addresses for 69 were found using the Alumni Relations data bank. Eight additional individuals, graduates of the class of 2000, were included in the study. In the study completed by Shomion- Karsnia, there were 110 individuals identified which was 14 percent greater than the 94 individuals in the current study. The current study had a return rate of 55.69% or 44 of 79

surveys returned. The response rate was higher than that of Shomion-Karsnia's (38%) (1996) and is considered an acceptable sample return rate.

Instrumentation

The original survey was a modification of an instrument designed for Brigham Young University. That instrument was modified slightly from the original by Shomion- Karsnia (1996). Modifications included an updated course list, current licensing possibilities, clearer vocabulary and elimination of salary information. Other modifications made the instrument more user- friendly, such as the inclusion of numbers on each item in the course list rather than each having a blank for the subject to fill in. A copy of the current survey can be found in the Appendix B.

The responses are based on a Likert scale where low values correspond to negative impressions and high (7) values reflect positive attitudes toward the subject. As part of the analyses of the present study, a test-retest correlation will be performed. This test-retest reliability coefficient demonstrates the "degree of correspondence" (Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S., 1997, p.85) between the two instruments.

Validity in this study is based on the clarity of content within the items on the survey. This study has face, content and professional inter-rater validity. The directions were clearly stated as were the rating benchmarks used in average vocabularies. Face validity derives from the fact that the survey does look like a survey and when subjects are given the survey, they think it will be used for the purpose that it appears to demonstrate. If an instrument addresses a representative sample of behavior of the domain that it is testing, it is said to have content validity. It is important to sample all the behaviors in a correct proportion for content validity to be present. The sampling of demographics, job duties, course utility and adequacy are relevant

to the preparation of a graduate for their future employment. Due to the fact that the instrument was based on another, previously used survey and also because of several sources of reliability and validity, this instrument was determined to be effective for the purpose for which it was needed.

Analysis

The statistical method in this study is primarily descriptive statistics, namely mean and standard deviation. Additionally, descriptive data were necessary for demographics and overall ratings of courses and information on job duties.

Procedure

Potential subjects ($n = 94$) were initially identified in May 2000 through the Graduate School office of the University of Minnesota- Duluth. They represented graduates of the program from 1995 to 2000. Once the names were obtained, they were given to the Alumni Relations office where addresses were located. Those addresses that no longer received mail from the University were eliminated. The remaining subjects ($n = 69$) were mailed a survey; a postage paid envelope and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey (See Appendix A). Current graduating second year ($n = 8$) students received the survey in their departmental mailboxes. When a survey was returned, it was given a code number. However, the principle evaluator was aware of who was responding. Graduates who had not returned their surveys by the date it was requested were telephoned and asked to return their surveys. The information gathered from the survey was entered into a database and analyzed for content.

It is assumed that those graduates who returned their surveys voluntarily consented to participating in the study. Their answers could then be analyzed. The alumni were told of the benefits in the letter that accompanied the survey (See Appendix A). They were told they would

be helping prepare future graduates, but that there would be no other compensation for completing the study. There were no risks relating to the return of the survey, including the negative surveys because there were no negative consequences for those who had already graduated. In addition, responses were anonymous. The instructions included within the survey were standardized because each participant received the same survey. The hypothesis was stated subtly in the letter accompanying the survey: "The information you provide will be used to improve the education of students enrolling in the Graduate Program in Counseling Psychology at UMD. The University does its best to anticipate the trends, but those who are already in the field are valuable resources. Your completion of the survey will be most beneficial for the department as we tailor the education of our students to the needs and demands of the ever-changing field"(Cover Letter, See Appendix A).

Confounding Variables

The survey itself was written in non-biased language and allowed for answers that were both negative and positive. As stated previously, this survey was a modification of Shomion-Karsnia's which was modeled after a survey for Brigham Young University. In surveys such as these, there are no treatment confounds, with the minor exception of language use. However, this was addressed by using vocabulary that was clear and concise. The instructions given were similar to Shomion- Karsnia's and had clear wording. There seem to be no other confounding variables present.

When the surveys were returned, the name of each participant was noted on a master list and a subject number was assigned to his or her survey. Only the research assistant had access to study numbers assigned to respondents. Additionally, the marker of S for school and C for community according to the practicum experience was assigned. The information was then input

into the computer file and the results were generated.

Results

Of the 79 surveys sent, there were 44 returned resulting in a 55.69% return rate. This rate is considered an acceptable return rate and is considerably higher than Shomion-Karsnia's (1996) of 38%. The number of surveys returned suggests that alumni are concerned with the content of the program as well as the education of currently enrolled students in the Counseling Psychology program. These return results are also noteworthy because there appear to be enough results upon which to base future decisions about the program.

Subjects

Of the 44 respondents, there are 43 whose highest degree earned is an M.A. There was one alumnus who subsequently earned an EdD. There were no graduates who had either completed an M.Ed or a Ph.D. One graduate had also earned an LPN diploma in addition to an M.A. Coursework in graduate school was completed as follows: 43 completed their master's coursework at UMD on a full time basis and one attended part-time. The following table describes the emphasis of their degrees from UMD.

Table 1: Graduate Respondents' Degree Emphases

Name of emphasis	N	Percent
Community / Agency	26	59.1
Elementary	6	13.6
Secondary	13	29.6
College	3	6.8
Middle	2	4.6

There were 4 respondents who marked 2 responses, for example, Elementary and Secondary, indicating preparation in both areas.

The licensure of alumni is an important gauge for comparing how graduates are in relation to career aspirations. Of UMD's graduates, 6 are Counselor Certified in Minnesota, 1 in Wisconsin and 2 in Hawaii. One alumni is licensed K-12, 2 who are licensed 5-12 and 2 with a

Board of Teaching Certificate (one in Health and one in Counseling). There is one Licensed Psychological Practitioner, one Provisional Chartered Psychologist, and one who is NBC Certified. There are 2 who do not have counselor licenses, one with a License in Practical Nursing and 16 respondents who didn't answer.

Table 2: License Types of Graduate Respondents.

Licenses	N
Counselor Certified- MN	6
Counselor Certified- HI	2
K-12 Counselor License	3
Board of Teaching License	2
Licensed Psychological Practitioner	1
Provisional Chartered Psychologist	1
Counselor Certified – WI	1
LPN	1
No Answer	16

Even with such a varied response, all of those surveyed ($n = 33$) spent at least some time ($m = 29.621$, $r = 2.55$) using counseling skills at their place of employment. Their places of employment are:

Table 3: Respondents' Settings of Employment

Setting of employment	N
Counseling	19
Elementary	2
Secondary	11
University	10
Teaching	6
Business	6
Self-Employed (non-counseling)	1
Homemaker	1
Student	1
Unemployed	3
Self-employed (counseling)	1
Other	11

Alumni were instructed to check all settings where they were employed. Because this survey was sent to graduates of the last five years, there was a range of 1-7 years of experience in the counseling field. The average was 2.7 years for the 36 respondents. Included within this figure were two individuals who had left the field after working in it, and seven who never entered the field at all. Additionally, because the survey included students about to graduate from the program, there were three who were unemployed and it is unknown if they were planning on pursuing employment within the counseling field.

The results for the section on employment functions are critical for the University of Minnesota- Duluth to consider. It includes the time involved in the employment activity as well as the adequacy of training.

Individual counseling was both the function that had the most time dedicated ($m = 27.578$) as well as the highest response ($n = 38$) and adequacy of training ($m = 6.131$). The table summarizes the amount of time spent in the different employment functions (by percentage of time). It is arranged by mean adequacy of preparation for each function with rankings on a 1-7 Likert-type scale with a ranking of seven representing outstanding and a rank of one indicating unsatisfactory preparation for a particular employment function.

Table 4: Employment functions of School and Community Counselors arranged by adequacy

Question 9. Employment Functions.					
Course Name	Range of %	% of time N	Mean % of time	Adequacy (n responding)	Adequacy (1-7) m
Individual Counseling	1-75	32	27.578	38	6.131
Group Counseling	1-50	21	15.809	33	5.696
Classroom Guidance/Workshop Presentation	1-50	24	10.562	32	5.468
Consultation	1-60	21	11.785	32	4.875
Supervision	2-50	14	12.714	31	4.87
Crisis Intervention	2-30	25	9.72	35	4.714
Leadership/Program Development/Planning	1-40	22	10.75	34	4.676
Teaching/In-Service	1-90	14	17.464	32	4.5
Family Counseling	1-40	15	10.933	30	4.4
Testing/Appraisal/Diagnosis	2-40	12	11.5	29	4.137
Staffing Cases/Community Agency Contact	1-70	17	12.176	28	3.857
Career Counseling	1-40	19	12.2	34	3.852
Research/Grant Writing/Program Evaluation	1-20	11	5.954	27	3.74
Orientation	1-40	11	9.681	25	3.68
Administration	1-30	14	9.821	28	3.428
Clerical	1-25	20	9.925	32	3
Placement/Applications/Financial Aid	2-10	9	4.88	26	2.538

It is important for UMD considers this information because it can help with the planning of curriculum. It would be foolish to increase educational hours on an employment function that most alumni do not spend time on. It would, however be prudent to increase educational hours on those functions that are used often, especially those with lower adequacy ratings.

Alumni responses indicate that they were most adequately prepared for Individual Counseling ($n = 38$, $m = 6.131$, $sd = .833$), Group Counseling ($n = 33$, $m = 5.697$, $sd = 1.243$) and Classroom Guidance/Workshops ($n = 32$, $m = 5.469$, $sd = 1.299$), ranked first, fifth and 13th

respectively in time spent in these activities. On the other hand, Placement Functions($n = 26$, $m = 2.538$, $sd = 1.247$) Clerical Functions ($n = 32$, $m = 3$, $sd = 1.639$) and Research Functions ($n = 27$, $m = 3.741$, $sd = 1.691$) were ranked 19 of 19, 14 of 19 and 18 of 19. The relationships within and among these data are important to consider during continued curriculum revision of the program.

Breakdown between School Counseling and Community Counseling

One factor to consider about the data presented is that it represents a compilation of data based on School and Community Counselors' reactions to the utility and adequacy preparation for various employment functions. Since School Counselors and Community Counselors have varying responsibilities due to the settings of employment, the breakdown between the two groups may provide some insight for the specialization of courses within the program. The following table represents the Community Counselors' assessment of adequacy of preparation for employment functions.

Table 5: Community Counselors' assessment of adequacy for employment functions arranged by most to least amount of time spent in function

Employment Function	Adequacy N	Adequacy m (1-7)	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Time N	Percentage of time m	Percentage of time Standard Deviation
Individual Counseling	22	6	1	19	31.105	21.297
Group Counseling	18	5.277	1.28	11	17.727	14.467
Supervision	16	4.6875	1.446	9	16.555	20.206
Consultation	17	5	1.372	11	13.273	17.389
Teaching/In Service	16	4.5	1.323	8	13.25	27.169
Staffing	16	4.25	1.601	12	13.16	13.384
Testing/ Appraisal/ Diagnosis	15	4.533	1.499	8	12.5	13.407
Career Counseling	19	4.0	1.598	12	12.416	11.849
Clerical	18	3.888	1.883	12	10.5	7.376
Orientation	13	3.846	1.609	7	9.714	12.646
Family Counseling	17	4.412	0.9737	7	9.714	12.656
Leadership/ Program Development/ Planning	22	4.318	1.662	14	9.5	8.575
Administration	14	3.929	1.099	7	8.423	6.411
Classroom Guidance/ Workshop Presentation	17	5.412	1.286	12	7.5	7.194
Crisis Counseling	20	4.7	0.9	15	7.13	5.725
Placement/ Application/Financial Aid	13	2.769	1.625	4	5.75	4.264
Research/ Grant Writing/ Program Evaluation	13	4.308	1.635	5	2.6	1.356

The following table is the School Counselors' assessment of adequacy, again arranged by the percentage of time spent within the employment function.

Table 6: School Counselors' assessment of adequacy for employment functions arranged by most to least amount of time spent in function

	Adequacy N	Adequacy m (1-7)	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Time N	Percentage of time m	Percentage of time Standard Deviation
Individual Counseling	16	6.188	0.808	13	30.885	17.742
Teaching/ In Service	16	4.313	1.991	8	20.5	27.821
Staffing	11	3.633	1.966	6	15.584	24.383
Leadership/ Program Development/ Planning	16	4.437	1.413	9	11.888	12.897
Classroom Guidance/ Workshop Presentation	15	5.466	1.258	12	11.833	12.839
Administration	15	3.2	0.979	7	11.5	8.189
Career Counseling	16	3.97	1.18	9	11.111	8.089
Crisis Counseling	15	4.8	0.909	10	10.9	9.137
Crisis Counseling	15	4.8	0.909	10	10.9	9.137
Orientation	13	3.615	0.923	4	9.75	11.713
Consultation	16	4.813	1.13	11	9.727	13.678
Family Counseling	14	4.571	1.498	6	9.166	7.733
Clerical	16	2.688	1.21	8	9.063	6.366
Research/ Grant Writing/ Program Evaluation	15	3.333	1.814	6	8.833	7.946
Testing/ Appraisal/ Diagnosis	15	3.933	1.339	6	7.5	7.911
Supervision	15	5.131	1.024	5	5.8	2.135
Placement/Financial Aid	12	2.375	0.5448	5	4.2	1.7888

Individual counseling was the top employment function both for School Counselors ($n_{\text{rank}} = 16$, $m_{\text{rank}} = 6.188$, $n_{\text{percent}} = 13$, $m_{\text{percent}} = 30.885$) and Community Counselors ($n_{\text{rank}} = 22$, $m_{\text{rank}} = 6.0$, $n_{\text{percent}} = 19$, $m_{\text{percent}} = 31.105$). It was also represented the most adequate preparation for Community Counselors and was second for School Counselors. Group Counseling was used an average of 17.727 percent ($n_{\text{rank}} = 18$, $m_{\text{rank}} = 5.27$, $n_{\text{percent}} = 11$) of

Community counselors' days, while Teaching occupied the second space with 20.5 percent ($n_{\text{rank}} = 16$, $m_{\text{rank}} = 4.313$, $n_{\text{percent}} = 8$) of School counselors' days. Table 7 compares the top three functions of School and Community Counselors and the combined results.

Table 7: A Comparison of the top three Employment Function Adequacy Scores and Percentage of Time for School Counselors, Community Counselors and Overall.

	N _{Ranking}	Mean Ranking	N _{percent}	Mean Percent of time
<i>Top Community Percentage of Time</i>				
Individual Counseling	22	6	19	31.105
Group Counseling	18	5.27	11	17.727
Supervision	16	4.88	9	16.55
<i>Top Community Adequacy</i>				
Individual Counseling	22	6	19	31.105
Classroom Guidance/ Workshop Presentation	17	5.412	12	7.5
Group Counseling	18	5.27	11	17.727
<i>Top School Percentage of Time</i>				
Individual	16	6.188	13	30.885
Teaching/ In Service	16	4.313	7	9.714
Staffing	11	3.633	6	15.584
<i>Top School Adequacy</i>				
Individual Counseling	16	6.188	13	30.855
Classroom Guidance	15	5.466	12	11.833
Supervision	15	5.131	5	5.8
<i>Top Overall Percentage of Time</i>				
Individual Counseling	38	6.131	32	27.578
Teaching / In Service	32	4.5	14	17.464
Group Counseling	33	5.696	21	15.809
<i>Top Overall Adequacy</i>				
Individual Counseling	38	6.131	32	27.578
Group Counseling	33	5.696	21	15.809
Classroom Guidance	32	5.468	24	10.562

Coursework at UMD

Many times, during the course of education, students are apt to ask, "Will this really be useful?" This is an important question to address. The following survey results attempt to answer the questions "Was this course useful in preparing your for your place of employment?" and "Was the preparation received from this course adequate for your needs in your current

employment setting?” The overwhelming response to the practicum experience (now known as Internship) was that this was useful. This experience received the highest usefulness rating in the survey ($n = 40$, $m = 6.325$). This response was from all types of settings: Elementary School ($n = 7$), Middle/Junior High ($n = 10$), High School ($n = 13$), College Counseling Center ($n = 8$), College Career Center ($n = 4$), Treatment Center ($n = 4$), Grief Center ($n = 3$), Community Agency ($n = 7$) and others ($n = 3$).

The overall adequacy for the program was $m = 5.2638$ ($n = 21$, $sd = .502$) with a score of 1 being Deficient and 7 being Outstanding. Slightly higher was the utility of the academic preparation: $m = 5.305$ ($n = 22$, $sd = .591$). Table 8 is the ranking of utility scores for both school and community counselors.

Table 8: Respondents' Ranking of Courses by Utility (most useful to least useful)

<i>Course</i>	<i>Adequacy n</i>	<i>Adequacy m</i>	<i>Utility n</i>	<i>Utility m</i>
Counseling Skills	40	5.95	40	6.25
Group Counseling	41	5.073	40	5.75
Adolescent Psychology	25	5.52	23	5.695
Counseling Procedures	41	5.39	40	5.65
Developmental Guidance	42	5.66	40	5.6
Seminar: Guidance/Ethics	41	5	40	5.6
Psychopathology	36	5.222	34	5.5625
Electives	34	5.647	30	5.466
Seminar: Professional Issues	39	5	37	5.351
Psychopharmacology	19	5.842	34	5.315
Biological Bases of Behavior	31	5.58	30	5.2
Child Development	25	5.08	25	5.16
Family Counseling	41	4.731	39	5.153
Tests and Measurements	40	5.25	40	5.025
Human Learning	43	5.348	39	5
Cross Cultural Counseling	43	3.837	39	5
Career Development	42	4.476	36	4.944
Psychological Consultation	41	4.829	40	4.725
Plan B Credits	40	5.45	38	4.5
Methods of Research	41	5.804	39	4.41
Statistics	42	5.785	40	4.15
Overall Preparation	34	5.647	30	5.466

The following table is the same information as the preceding table but it is arranged in rank order by adequacy mean.

Table 9: Respondents' Ranking of Courses by Adequacy (most to least adequate)

Course	Adequacy n	Adequacy m	Utility n	Utility m
Counseling Skills	40	5.95	40	6.25
Psychopharmacology	19	5.842	34	5.647
Methods of Research	41	5.804	39	4.41
Statistics	42	5.785	40	4.15
Developmental Guidance	42	5.66	40	6.825
Electives	34	5.647	30	5.466
Biological Bases of Behavior	31	5.58	30	5.2
Adolescent Psychology	25	5.52	23	5.695
Plan B Credits	40	5.45	38	4.5
Counseling Procedures	41	5.39	40	5.65
Human Learning	43	5.348	39	5
Tests and Measurements	40	5.25	40	5.025
Psychopathology	36	5.222	34	5.735
Child Development	25	5.08	25	5.16
Group Counseling	41	5.073	40	5.75
Seminar: Guidance/Ethics	41	5	40	5.6
Seminar: Professional Issues	39	5	37	5.351
Psychological Consultation	41	4.829	40	4.725
Family Counseling	41	4.731	39	5.153
Career Development	42	4.476	36	4.944
Cross Cultural Counseling	43	3.837	39	5
Overall Preparation	34	5.647	30	5.466

It is significant to note that both the most and least useful as well as the most and least adequate classes are different although counseling skills ($n = 40$, $m = 5.95$, $sd = 1.244$) does top both lists. Alumni indicated that Psychopharmacology ($n = 19$, $m = 5.842$, $sd = 1.565$) and Human Learning ($n = 43$, $m = 5.3488$, $sd = 1.118$) were the most adequate while Cross Cultural Counseling ($n = 43$, $m = 3.837$, $sd = 1.524$), Career Development ($n = 42$, $m = 4.476$, $sd = 1.699$) were seen as least able to adequately meet the career needs of the alumni. Statistics ($n = 40$, $m = 4.15$, $sd = 1.711$), Methods ($n = 39$, $m = 4.4103$, $sd = 1.720$) and Plan B Credits ($n =$

38, $m = 4.5$, $sd = 1.929$) were ranked lowest on the utility scale while Counseling Skills, Group Counseling ($n = 40$, $m = 5.75$, $sd = 1.561$) were ranked highest.

Feedback

Many students value the relationships they have with the teaching faculty because the professors are mentors to them as they progress through the program. Faculty are sources of information about the field and have seen the student in action and can offer helpful guidance when a student is developing. On a scale of 1 (deficient) to 7 (outstanding), alumni were asked to rate the feedback on their progress through the program in three areas: practical applications of counseling received the highest rating ($n = 44$, $m = 5.704$), theoretical foundations of counseling ($n = 43$, $m = 5.279$), and personal development ($n = 44$, 5.272) were nearly the same, with theoretical foundations being slightly higher.

Table 10: Perceived Adequacy of Faculty Feedback in Personal and Professional Development

	N	Mean
Theoretical Foundations of Counseling	43	5.279
Practical Applications of Counseling	44	5.704
Personal Development	44	5.272

These same categories were also used to rate Faculty Availability. The ranking was still the same, but the responses were more diverse. According to the alumni responses, Faculty Availability for the practical applications of counseling ($n = 42$, $m = 5.785$) was highest, followed by theoretical foundations of counseling ($n = 42$, $m = 5.785$) and personal development ($n = 42$, $m = 5.476$). The average overall availability was 5.650 ($n = 40$).

Table 11: Perceived Adequacy of Faculty Availability

	N	Mean
Theoretical Foundations of Counseling	42	5.642
Practical Applications of Counseling	42	5.785
Personal Development	42	5.476
Overall	40	5.650

The final question asked for the alumnus' overall rating of the educational experience with the program in counseling at the University of Minnesota- Duluth. All 44 alumni rated this question with the mean being 5.25 with a ranking of one being disappointed, a "4" ranking being satisfied and "7" being delighted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Students from the counseling program at UMD have had relatively similar experiences during the completion of their degrees. This conclusion is based on the finding that 43 of 44 graduates have the same degree and 43 of 44 completed the program on a full time basis. Additionally, the even distribution of the program between Community (52%) and School (42%) Counseling indicates that both emphases are equally attractive to perspective students. Due to the fact that College Counseling is a recent addition to the program it is understandable that there are few graduates or alumni employed in these settings. This area, however, would be a profitable area to market to prospective students, and seems to fit the general structure and approach of the curriculum.

One area that the Counseling Psychology Graduate program could benefit from expanding would be in the licensure of graduates. With 15 of a possible 44 responses, and with most of the licenses being in school settings, licensure of graduates is an issue. Because of CACREP accreditation, the graduates are able to take the NBCC-NCE exam prior to graduation, but licensure is a post-degree issue. One explanation of the low numbers of individuals with licensure involves the limitations placed upon the licensee in Minnesota. At present, Minnesota is one of 4 states without master's level counselor licensure (www.aca.org, 2001). As a result, the only license available is a highly restricted one administered by the Board of Psychology. A master's level Licensed Psychological Practitioner, until August of 2001, "had no ability to receive third party reimbursement. As a result, agencies hired master's level Social Workers to carry out counseling related functions"(Hovland,2001). As the Minnesota Legislature, with recommendations by the Board of Psychology, amended statutes, they "created more viability in this level of preparation" (Hovland, 2001). Licenses will become more viable "as the Board

addresses lifetime supervision requirement” (Hovland, 2001), which is seen as a detriment to employment. According to the rest of the survey, UMD seems to be educating the graduates in appropriate ways, so for future employment, recruiting and publicity purposes, this change in licensing could benefit the program. In light of the recent improvements in licensure viability, it would be recommended that the graduate program also consider a more pro-active, pre-graduation approach to licensure.

Employment is the ultimate goal of an educational program. Alumni spend countless hours studying, learning, and practicing in internships in order to become competent entry-level counselors. They also spend financial resources because they believe that a university will prepare them for a satisfying career counseling people. Fortunately, the majority of the graduates are using their skills. There is some concern about the individuals who, after this preparation, are not using the skills gained to help people. The survey did not address reasons for unemployment or underemployment. However, one of the main complaints of the community/ agency track graduates was that they felt unprepared for anything specific and that they truly needed a doctoral degree to find gainful employment in the state of Minnesota.

These complaints are answered by the new legislation discussed earlier regarding the new LPP licensure. A solution for this concern about generalist preparation is that intentional relationships between students and teaching faculty could to be formed so that upon graduation students know what to expect both within the employment setting and along the paths they take to reach their employment destinations. If faculty look past graduation as the end of their role with students and instead incorporate an emphasis on satisfying employment, it is possible that these employment figures as well as types of licensure may increase. Looking past graduation to the future may ensure that the graduates of UMD’s program are both well prepared for the field

of counseling as well as committed to contributing to the field of counseling through their suitable employment.

Employment Functions

As stated previously, it is important for UMD to consider these functions, their time and adequacy scores. Fortunately, for UMD, the function that had the highest preparation adequacy also had the highest percentage of time. This survey seems to indicate a strength of the program is in counseling practice, especially individual counseling. In this, the program should be proud, but they still need improvement in other areas. For example, the adequacy score on Placement/Financial Aid was 2.5 on a 1-7 scale. This is also the area where the least time is spent, but future college graduates are relying on the advice of their guidance counselor. It would be easy to pass this on saying, "The fewest graduates use this skill and it takes the least time, we need to focus on more important employment functions." These individuals need to notice that the second highest use of time is Teaching and In Service. The adequacy score is 4.5 on the same 1-7 Likert scale and at least one individual spends 90% of his/her time in this area.

In the program at UMD, students must take Statistics, Research Methods, Plan B credits and Testing and Measurements. All these courses point toward the importance of statistical research in the counseling program. Additionally, most courses include current research on trends, projects requiring research and each graduate performs his/her own statistically based research. Ironically, research as an employment function has one of the lowest scores ($n = 27$, $m = 3.741$, $sd = 1.691$). If graduates aren't prepared in any area, but especially one as critical as research, it reflects on their educational institution. The faculty in the statistical areas need to make the usefulness of statistics relevant to the students and their employment goals. The overall

adequacy scores (range = 2.5-6.131) with the average being 4.327. UMD, as an institution, encourages students to excel, as graduates; the alumni surveyed are challenging UMD to excel.

These statistics are important for UMD to consider as it prepares course requirements. It is important to look beyond graduation to employment and prepare the students for what they will encounter.

Coursework at UMD

Overall, UMD's Counseling Psychology alumni rated the adequacy at 5.647 and the utility at 5.466. But like the employment functions, there is more to the story than the picture the statistics present. Because CACREP accredits UMD's program, the program must meet these accreditation standards presented by the ACA. The following course groupings are based on ACA's standards for Program Objectives and Curriculum (1994).

I. Human Growth and Development

The coursework in this area includes those which "provide an understanding of the nature and needs of individuals at all developmental levels" (CACREP, 1994, p.60). The courses that were included were: Human Learning, Child Development, Developmental Guidance, Adolescent Psychology, Family and Psychopathology. This area was, by far, the area which had the most courses included. The average utility score was 5.683 and the average adequacy was 5.366. There are many courses included within this standard, but it is the nature of the wording of the standard. Family Counseling, included within this standard, was ranked low (19 of 21) in its adequacy score. It would be advisable for a faculty committee to review the course, its evaluations, its content, and come to some conclusions about the focus of this course.

II. Social and Cultural Foundations

The coursework in this area “provide[s] an understanding of issues and trends in a multicultural and diverse society” (CACREP, 1994, p. 60.) Cross-Cultural Counseling (adequacy: $m = 3.837$, utility: $m = 5$) was the lowest ranked adequacy score. In the present environment, multiculturalism and diversity are two key areas in which employers expect their employees to excel. While each graduate can claim to have taken a Cross-Cultural Counseling course, the preparation, according to graduates lacks the necessary components for successful employment in a multicultural setting. To improve, it would benefit faculty to discover what mental health issues the different cultural groups deal with as well as overarching issues, such as poverty, language barriers or racism and their affects on individuals’ mental health. Also, discussing with students their expectations for the course could reveal some beneficial course goals and learning objectives. This would be an easy, as well as beneficial area upon which to improve.

III. Helping Relationships

UMD’s strength is their counseling preparation courses which “provide an understanding of counseling and consultation processes” (CACREP, 1994, p.61). Counseling Skills (utility: $m = 6.25$, adequacy: $m = 5.95$) and Counseling Procedures (utility: $m = 5.65$, adequacy: $m = 5.39$) are both in the top of the rankings (1 of 21 and 4 of 21) for utility. Additionally, Counseling Skills also tops the list of adequacy. Counseling Procedures, however, barely made it into the top half (10 of 21). Of course it would be beneficial for the counseling program to achieve excellence by improving, but this particular area could be addressed later in the process. Psychological Consultation is a skill graduates use with some frequency (11%, 4 of 17). However, the adequacy of preparation ($m = 4.7875$) and the adequacy of the course ($m = 4.829$, 18 of 21) are lower than either of the two other courses.. As the department considers the

possible changes in this area, they could consider the necessary experiences in counseling as well as the experiences necessary in consulting to be adequately prepared for this employment function. Additionally, it is noted that the alumni were recent graduates, possibly not having the experience needed to be skilled in this area. However, as the program continues to refine itself, the high standards of the Helping Relationships courses must be maintained. Counseling is the most often used employment function.

IV. Group Work

The course, Group Counseling, “provides an understanding of group development, dynamics, counseling theories, group counseling methods and skills and other group work approaches” (CACREP, 1994). The adequacy (15 of 21, $m = 5.073$) and utility scores (2 of 21, $m = 5.75$) paint a mixed picture of a high usefulness ranking and a lower adequacy ranking in relation to other courses. One possible explanation is that because group counseling is part of the “core curriculum” all graduates are required to take this class. As a result, the focus may be too broad for students to gain the understanding needed for their specialized area of practice (Hovland, 2001). Additionally, the Community counselors use the skill of group counseling more than do the school counselors, which may contribute to the seemingly mixed results, while still maintaining above average scores. Perhaps the department could consider modifying the course to include a more focused application of the counseling skills to the specific disciplines within the framework of the course.

V. Career and Lifestyle Development

The course, Career Development, satisfies the CACREP Standard that expects “an understanding of career development and related life factors” (1994). Both utility (17 of 21 $m = 4.944$) and adequacy (20 of 21 $m = 4.476$) are lower than other courses. This area would benefit

from an investigation by faculty on student expectations as well as employment setting expectations. Conclusions based on this survey would indicate that most graduates found the course useful, but not as useful as other core courses. However, Career Counseling takes up 12% of an employee's time. Therefore, the adequacy and utility scores might be expected to improve.

VI. Appraisal

Tests and Measurements is the course which meets the expectation of providing "an understanding of the individual and group approaches to assessment and evaluation" (CACREP, 1994). The adequacy (12 of 21 $m = 5.25$) and utility (14 of 21, $m = 5.025$) scores are above average (3.5) and alumni indicate they spend 11.5% of their time with testing. Again, improvement can come if faculty look past graduation to employment and find out how testing is used. It would also be advisable to ask students what their expectations for the course are. The end of semester evaluations may provide important clues on how to improve this course to meet the needs of the graduates.

VII. Research and Program Evaluation

The adequacy and utility results of Methods of Research, Statistics and Plan B credits are mixed. The utility rankings are 20 of 21, 21 of 21 and 19 of 21 while the adequacy rankings are 3 of 21, 4 of 21 and 9 of 21. These courses required by CACREP are not as useful as other courses but were taught well, according to survey results. These courses "provide an understanding of types of research methods, basic statistics, and ethical and legal considerations in research" (CACREP, 1994). Students will still have to take these classes, but fortunately for the students at UMD, these courses are taught well. To improve the adequacy score, faculty need to make it more relevant to the everyday practice of masters prepared counselors.

Traditional research methods are important, but perhaps for this level of practice, program evaluation or client outcome studies need greater emphasis. The results of the survey tend to suggest that it is important that program faculty address the utility of the courses presently taught.

VIII. Professional Orientation

The Ethics and Professional Issues seminars complete the CACREP requirement of “studies that provide an understanding of all aspects of professional functioning including history, roles, organizational structures, ethics, standards and credentialing” (1994). It might benefit UMD to consider these courses as a way to improve the lower rates of licensure of their graduates. These courses are critical to looking past graduation and focusing on future employment of graduates.

IX. Other (not included in CACREP Standards)

Psychopharmacology and Biological Bases are not included in the CACREP standards, however they are used for LPP licensure. The usefulness of these courses, ranked 10th and 11th of 21 respectively, is average, however the adequacy shows an interesting picture.

Psychopharmacology is ranked second ($m = 5.842$) while Biological Bases is seventh ($m = 5.58$). These courses are necessary within the program and the department, as always, may want to consider the student evaluations for areas of improvement.

Internship and Practicum Experience

Overwhelmingly, students appreciated their Practicum/Internship experience. These requirements “are considered to be the most critical experience elements in the program” (CACREP Standards, 1994). The usefulness rating (1-7) was 6.325. This critical experience was also a positive, useful experience for the alumni of the Counseling Psychology graduate program at UMD.

Financial Assistance

On the whole, students were pleased with the teaching assistantships ($m = 4.878$), program advisor positions ($m = 5.222$), cost of living ($m = 5.820$) and loans ($m = 5.6$) available while at UMD (Deficient (1) to Adequate (4) to Outstanding (7)). The availability of scholarships ($m = 2.971$), however, is very low. Before the program adds a scholarship program, it should consider the consequences of such an action. It would be advisable to discuss with another program, such as the Communication Sciences and Disorders, what they see as the benefits and liabilities of such financial assistance. Adding a scholarship dimension to the program could attract more students, and it could also foster a more competitive spirit within the program. UMD is, however, surpassing the standards set by CACREP: "Effort is made to secure financial assistance for students in the program to facilitate full -time study, and includes but is not limited to... (a) monitoring to ensure that the program receives a proportionate share of institutional funds allocated for such purposes, and (b) informing students of available loans, part- time work, graduate assistantships and fellowships and other sources of financial aid" (1994).

Faculty Availability

Overall, it seems that the faculty does a good job giving feedback to the students about their progress in the program. The perception of availability also has to do with whether the student actually sought the time of the faculty. For example, one student remarked "I guess my instructors were available, I maybe didn't seek them out so often." Additionally, personality of faculty as well as other issues within the department contributed to whether students sought their counsel. "Some faculty were outstanding, and I am grateful. Other faculty were less than

accommodating.” But overall, the general consensus was summed up in the following written comment: the “faculty was helpful and took great pride in the success of their students.”

Summary

The graduates of the Counseling Psychology Program, formerly Educational Psychology, at the University of Minnesota-Duluth have rated their educational experience above average. The Individual Counseling course provided the most adequate preparation for the graduates’ future use. The courses in Cross Cultural Counseling as well as the course in Career Counseling are areas, though still above average, where the program could improve. Additionally, by bringing the focus to employment rather than graduation, students exiting the program will be knowledgeable about the counseling profession as well as informed about the career decisions they will be making. Following the changes outlined in this report, the already above average program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Minnesota, Duluth will be an example of excellent counselor education in the state of Minnesota.

Summary of Recommendations

- Look past graduation to employment as the goal of the program
- Have a pro-active, pre-graduation licensure focus
- Build constructive faculty-student mentoring relationships
- Examine student course expectations and course outcomes, especially in Family Counseling, Career Development, Cross Cultural Counseling and Tests and Measurements
- Consider modifying Group Counseling course to meet needs of Community Counselors and School Counselors separately

- Modify Research Components to include information about the utility of statistics in employment settings or include information about grant writing and program evaluation
- Discuss with other departments the financial liabilities and benefits of student aid options, such as scholarships and teaching assistantships.

Sample of Written Student Comments

- Overall, I felt the program is good. What is difficult for me to evaluate is how this program directly helped me find work. This program does not earn someone a L.P. license, which is needed often in order for a community agency to hire you.
- Please, please consider developing a program for working counselors (evening or weekend program) to earn their K-12 licensure. I would Love to add elementary, which was not a viable option even 2 years ago. Also, consider ways to recruit working teachers and males into the school counseling profession.
- Excellent [feedback] from all instructors. I felt they really knew your strengths and weaknesses and could communicate them
- I really enjoyed grad school at UMD. Suggestions: Have a required focus on special education (and other populations—gifted and talented, etc) for school counseling students
- Currently beginning second year of PsyD program at U of St. Thomas. Was exceptionally well-prepared, particularly in areas of statistics, research methods and testing.
- I think there is a huge need for helping graduates locate jobs, considering all of the “connections” faculty is supposed to have.

- I realize UMD is a secular institution, however; I would like to have had more information or an elective class in how spirituality/ religion plays a part in a person's life and how it can be used in a counseling session.
- In the areas of Family Counseling, group counseling and Cross-Cultural, I found myself very unprepared. I have had to learn it as I have gone along. The individual counseling portion was excellent! I continue to utilize skills every day. My strongest suggestion is an emphasis in crisis counseling. This is where it is at, and many insurance companies are looking for this.
- I believe that UMD provides an excellent balance between the practical application aspects of psychology as well as opportunities to participate in research. Overall, it was a great experience and we really miss the community of Duluth! Thanks!

References

- Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S. (1997). Psychological Testing (7th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- CACREP Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual (4th Edition). (January 1994). Alexandria, VA: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs.
- Gum, M. (1990). Educational Psychology (Emphasis: Counseling) Review Document. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota, Duluth.
- Guralnik, D (Ed). (1967). Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (College Edition). Springfield, MA: Merriam- Webster.
- Henerson, M.E., Morris, L.L.; and Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1987). How to Measure Attitudes (2nd Edition). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krause, D. (1996). Effective Program Evaluation. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Owen, J. & Rogers, P. (1999). Program Evaluations: Forms & Approaches. London: Sage Publications.

Shomion- Karsnia, S. (1996). Training Adequacy and Job Effectiveness in a Master's Level Counseling Program. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Smith, M.J. (1990). Program Evaluation in the Human Services. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

University of Minnesota, Duluth, Department of Psychology. *Philosophy Document*. (2001).

www.aca.org. (2001). American Counseling Association Web page. [online].

Available : www.aca.org/

Table of Appendices

Appendix A : Cover Letter

Appendix B: Graduate Follow Up Survey

Appendix A

Cover Letter

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Duluth Campus

Department of Psychology

*College of Education & Human
Service Professions*

*320 Bohannon Hall
10 University Drive
Duluth, Minnesota 55812-2496*

*218-726-7117
Fax: 218-726-7186*

May 5, 2000

Dear Educational or Counseling Psychology Graduate,

Greetings! The Master's Program in Counseling Psychology (formerly known as Educational Psychology) is again completing the CACREP accreditation process. As part of this process, we are required to survey our graduates regarding the strengths and limitations of the program, as well as the relevance of the program to graduates' present employment.

The information you provide will also be used to improve the education of students enrolling in the graduate program at UMD. The University does its best to anticipate the trends, but those who are already in the field are valuable and usually untapped resources. Your completion of the survey will be most beneficial for the department as we tailor the education of our students to the needs and demands of the ever-changing field.

Please complete the enclosed survey as soon as you are able. It will be most useful if it is returned by May 22

The department would love to hear from you and how you're doing. Please feel free to include updated information with the survey. Thank you in advance for your time and for your continued commitment to the Program.

Sincerely,



Jane Hovland, Director of Graduate Studies.
Counseling Psychology
326 Bohannon Hall



Amanda Lufholm, Graduate
Research Assistant

Appendix B

Graduate Follow Up Survey

Graduate Program Follow Up Survey

Department of Counseling Psychology
(Formerly known as Educational Psychology)

University of MN-Duluth

Please complete the following survey. In completing and returning the following survey, you are granting UMD's Counseling Psychology Department permission to use this information for the purpose of program evaluation and development.

1. Name _____

2. Address _____

3. Sex :

☐ Male

☐ Female

4. Date of Birth _____
Month Day Year

5. Educational Background

Please check the appropriate response

What is the highest level of degree earned?

☐ M.Ed.

☐ Ph.D.

☐ MA

☐ Other _____

☐ Ed.D.

A. What was the emphasis of your highest degree from UMD?

☐ Community

☐ Secondary

☐ Agency

☐ College

☐ Elementary

☐ Other _____

B. How did you complete the majority of your coursework?

☐ Full Time

☐ Evenings

☐ Part Time(days)

☐ Summers only

☐ Other _____

6. General Employment Questions

A. What licenses have you received?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Licensed Psychologist (LP) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Licensed Psychological Practitioner (L.P.P.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Counselor Certification /License
State _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Teaching Certificate
[emphasis _____] | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Work License |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other[specify]_____ |

B. How many hours per week do you work in counseling? _____

C. In what settings are you employed? Check any that apply:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Counseling</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Teaching</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Student</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Agency</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Business</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Unemployed</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Elementary</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Self-employed (non-</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Self-employed</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Secondary</i> | <i>counseling)</i> | <i>(counseling)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>University</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Homemaker</i> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other</i> _____ | | |

7. Counseling

A. How many years of experience do you have in the counseling field? _____

B. If you are not working in the field, did you:

- ☐ Leave the field after working in it
- ☐ Never enter the field at all

If you are not working in the field, what is (are) your reason(s)?

Check any that apply

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No positions open | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal reasons | <input type="checkbox"/> Further education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Low salary | <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer current position |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unwilling to relocate | <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Comments:

8. Positions Held

A. What have been your job titles since you left the University?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

9. Employment Functions

For each of the functions below, please estimate the percentage of time you spend (within a year) engaged in that function. Also, using the scale (1-unsatisfactory, 7-outstanding) rate how well UMD prepared you for that function. Please answer NA if that function does not apply to your job.

%TIME IN ACTIVITY	ADEQUACY OF TRAINING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CAREER COUNSELING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 PLACEMENT/APPLICATIONS/FINANCIAL AID
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CLERICAL (records, scheduling, registration, insurance)
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CRISIS INTERVENTION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 GROUP COUNSELING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CLASSROOM GUIDANCE/ WORKSHOP PRESENTATION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ORIENTATION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FAMILY COUNSELING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CONSULTATION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 SUPERVISION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 TEACHING/IN- SERVICE
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 TESTING, APPRAISAL, DIAGNOSIS
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 LEADERSHIP/ PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 RESEARCH/GRANT WRITING/PROGRAM EVALUATION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ADMINISTRATION
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STAFFING CASES/COMMUNITY AGENCY CONTACT

OTHER EMPLOYMENT FUNCTIONS: (please specify)

_____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 _____

_____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 _____

comments:

10. Practicum/Internship Experience

A. Where did you complete your practicum?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary School | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle/Junior High School | <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment Center (juvenile, drug or adult) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School | <input type="checkbox"/> Grief Center |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College Counseling Center | <input type="checkbox"/> Community Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College Career Counseling Center | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

C. How useful was your practicum experience in preparing you to work in the field of counseling?

(Not Useful) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Very Useful)

Comments:

11. Academic Preparation

Please assess the adequacy of the training you received in the courses listed and the utility of the courses you took at UMD.

ADEQUACY

DEFICIENT (1) TO ADEQUATE (4) TO OUTSTANDING (7)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UTILITY

NOT USEFUL (1) TO ADEQUATE (4) TO VALUABLE(7)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	GROUP COUNSELING	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDANCE	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	COUNSELING SKILLS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	COUNSELING PROCEDURES	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	CROSS CULTURAL COUNSELING	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	FAMILY COUNSELING	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	HUMAN LEARNING	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSULTATION	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

ADEQUACY**UTILITY**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	STATISTICS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	METHODS OF RESEARCH	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	TESTS AND MEASUREMENTS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PLAN B CREDITS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	BIOLOGICAL BASES	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PSYCHOPATHOLOGY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	CHILD DEVELOPMENT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	CAREER DEVELOPMENT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	SEMINAR: GUIDANCE/ ETHICS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	SEMINAR: PROFESSIONAL ISSUES	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ELECTIVES	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	OVERALL PREPARATION	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Comments:

12. Financial Support

For the following, rate the adequacy of availability:

DEFICIENT (1) TO ADEQUATE (4) TO OUTSTANDING (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Scholarships

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Loans

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Teaching Assistantships

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Research Assistantships

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Program Advisor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Cost of Living

13. Feedback

How adequate was the feedback concerning your progress through the program with respect to:

DEFICIENT (1) TO ADEQUATE (4) TO OUTSTANDING (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Theoretical Foundations of Counseling

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Practical Applications of Counseling

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Personal Development

Comments:

14. Faculty Availability

To what extent were the faculty members available to advise you concerning

DEFICIENT (1) TO ADEQUATE (4) TO OUTSTANDING (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Theoretical Foundations of Counseling

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Practical Applications of Counseling

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Personal Development

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Overall

Comments:

15. Overall Satisfaction

All things considered, how satisfied are you with the program in counseling at the University of Minnesota, Duluth?

DISAPPOINTED (1) SATISFIED (4) DELIGHTED (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

COMMENTS: